

REMARKS

Applicant has amended the claims 1 and 4, and canceled the claims 3 and 6 without prejudice. Accordingly, the Office Action will be discussed in terms of the claims as amended.

The Examiner has rejected the Claims 1 through 6 under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being obvious over Keizo, saying that Keizo discloses deviation between the reference and the first image and the deviation between the reference and the second image, but fails to disclose that based upon the first and second image; but, as described in the English translation, the system positions the pattern on a chip using the images obtained by two cameras, therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention can simply use the images provided by the cameras 1 and 2 and aligned apparatuses, to improve the accuracy of the positioned detection system.

In reply thereto, Applicant has carefully reviewed Keizo, and respectfully submits that Keizo describes a high magnification imaging device and a low magnification imaging device and it is necessary to measure the offset amount with regard to each of the high magnification imaging device and low imaging device. In particular, the execution of positioning alignment with the use of high magnification images in Keizo provides highly accurate positioning alignment, resulting in highly accurate bonding. However, the use of high magnification images in Keizo makes the detection area small, limiting the detection. To compensate for this problem, the object in Keizo is performed using low magnification images and using the position that is roughly obtained, positional direction is performed using high magnification images. In other words, Applicant respectfully submits that while the object of Keizo is high accuracy bonding, position detection is always executed using high magnification images and offset is calculated based on both the high magnification image and the low magnification image. In particular, Applicant directs the Examiner's attention to page 189 of Keizo wherein in the upper left column, it states that positioning alignment patterns obtained by a low magnification camera and a high magnification camera can be different from each other.

In contrast thereto, Applicant's invention relates to superimposing the offsets at a high magnification image device and a low magnification imaging device. Still further, in Applicant's invention, reduction processing is performed on the image data in a specific region inside the reticle mark so as to obtain a reduced image (see fourth full paragraph on page 7 in Applicant's

Application). Then, the reduced image is superimposed on a low magnification image, thus calculating the deviations in obtaining the offset amount. Applicant respectfully submits that in Applicant's invention the offset amount can be more easily obtained than in Keizo.

Applicant respectfully submits the disadvantage of Applicant's invention of Keizo is important since in the bonding apparatuses the bonding tool is replaced at least once a day, and it is necessary on each replacement to measure the offset.

In view of the above, therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that the Claims 1, 2, 4, and 5 are not obvious over Keizo.

In view of the above, therefore, it is respectfully requested that this Amendment be entered, favorably considered and the case passed to issue.

Please charge any additional costs incurred by or in order to implement this Amendment or required by any requests for extensions of time to KODA & ANDROLIA DEPOSIT ACCOUNT NO. 11-1445.

Respectfully submitted,

KODA & ANDROLIA

By: 

William L. Androlia  
Reg. No. 27,177

2029 Century Park East  
Suite 1430  
Los Angeles, CA 90067-3024  
Tel: (310) 277-1391  
Fax: (310) 277-4118

Certificate of Transmission

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the Patent and Trademark Office Fax No. (703) 872-9306 on November 23, 2004.

William L. Androlia

Name

Signature

11/23/2004

Date